

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Yuba)

----

In re F.M., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court  
Law.

C085407

THE PEOPLE,

(Super. Ct. No.  
JDSQ1600136)

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

F.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

This appeal comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97. Having reviewed the record as required by *Wende* and *Kevin S.*, we affirm the judgment.

**I. BACKGROUND**

The juvenile court first declared the minor, F.M., a ward of the court under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 in January 2014. Over the years, he was

continued as a ward of the court following various adjudications for theft crimes, battery, and vandalism. As a result of an October 12, 2016, adjudication, the juvenile court placed the minor on probation. As one of the conditions of probation, the minor was ordered to be in his home between 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. unless with a parent or guardian.

The prosecution filed a petition in January 2017, alleging defendant had violated the conditions of his probation by leaving his home without his mother's permission. The minor admitted the violation of probation. The juvenile court set the maximum term of confinement based on aggregate terms from previously sustained wardship petitions at seven years six months. The juvenile court also ordered the minor continue as a ward of the court and be committed to a youth guidance center for no more than 365 days. While at the guidance center, the minor was subject to remand to the juvenile rehabilitation facility for remedial programs for no longer than 30 days, as deemed necessary.

## **II. DISCUSSION**

We appointed counsel to represent the minor on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436; *In re Kevin S., supra*, 113 Cal.App.4th 97.) The minor was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no communication from the minor.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to the minor.

### III. DISPOSITION

The dispositional order is affirmed.

/S/

---

RENNER, J.

We concur:

/S/

---

MAURO, Acting P. J.

/S/

---

MURRAY, J.